



Daily Report

West Europe

FBIS-WEU-96-040
Wednesday
28 February 1996

This report may contain copyrighted material. Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.

Daily Report

West Europe

FBIS-WEU-96-040

CONTENTS

28 February 1996

INTER-EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

EU: Article Discusses Major Topics for IGC [Paris <i>LES ECHOS</i> 27 Feb]	1
EU: Commission Paper Advocates Flexibility in EU [Brussels <i>EUROPEAN VOICE</i> 22-28 Feb]	2
EU: New Legislation Seeks Irreversible Transition to Euro [Brussels <i>EUROPEAN VOICE</i> 22-28 Feb]	3
EU To Examine Harmonization of Tax on Savings [Brussels <i>EUROPEAN VOICE</i> 22-28 Feb]	3
EU: France, Germany Seek Security Clause in Maastricht [Paris <i>Teletext</i>]	4

UNITED KINGDOM

UK: Risk of Reform of European Court of Human Rights [THE DAILY TELEGRAPH 28 Feb]	5
UK: UVF Prepared for Bloody Response to IRA [BELFAST SUNDAY LIFE 25 Feb]	5
UK: Paisley on Cease-Fire, Peace Process Prospects [BELFAST TELEGRAPH 26 Feb]	5
UK: Hume on Talks With Major, All-Party Talks [London TV]	7
UK: Major, Bruton Agree to Peace Summit in London [PRESS ASSOCIATION]	8
UK: Likely Agenda for Major, Bruton Summit [PRESS ASSOCIATION]	9
UK: Adams Discusses Conditions for IRA Cease-Fire [PRESS ASSOCIATION]	9

GERMANY

Germany: Kohl Gives 'Situation Report' on Moscow Visit [FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 27 Feb]	10
Germany: De Charette Speaks to Chambers of Industry, Commerce [French Ministry of Foreign Affairs WWW 22 Feb]	10
Germany: Discussion Following De Charette Chambers Speech [French Ministry of Foreign Affairs WWW 27 Feb]	13
Germany: General Views Disadvantages of Professional Army [DIE WELT 27 Feb]	14
Germany: Waigel Restates Need for National Stability Pact [HANDELSBLATT 27 Feb]	14
Germany: Greens Oppose Ratification of Europol Convention [FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 27 Feb]	15

FRANCE

France Suggests EU Redefine Free Trade Zone Efforts [LES ECHOS 27 Feb]	16
France: Chirac Visit to Asia for 'Improved' Relations [AFP]	16
France: Millon Writes in Support of New Defense Policy [LE MONDE 27 Feb]	17

ITALY

Italy: Navy Chief Fears 'Escalation' of Fishing Clashes [LA REPUBBLICA 27 Feb]	19
--	----

NORDIC COUNTRIES

Denmark

Denmark Attacks French Stance on South Africa Trade Pact [INFORMATION 27 Feb]	20
---	----

Finland

Finland: Halonen Rules Out Defense Alliance With Sweden [SVENSKA DAGBLADET 26 Feb]	20
--	----

Sweden

Sweden: Threat, Strength of Russian Forces Analyzed [DAGENS NYHETER 24 Feb]	20
---	----

Sweden: Hjelm-Wallen Sets Up New Submarine Inquiry [SVENSKA DAGBLADET 23 Feb]	23
---	----

CYPRUS

Cyprus: Kliridhis Rejects 'Dayton-Type Procedure' [CYPRUS NEWS AGENCY]	24
Cyprus: Atun Asks EU To Call Greek Cypriots to Negotiate [Bayrak Radio]	24

GREECE

Greece: Pangalos on EU Debate on Conflict With Turkey [Athens TV]	25
---	----

TURKEY

Turkey: Ciller Says Visit to Italy 'Positive' [Ankara TV]	26
Turkey: Ankara Welcomes EU Handling of CU Debate [ANATOLIA]	26
Turkey: Batu Discusses Policy Toward Greece [TURKIYE 24 Feb]	26
Turkey: U.S. Policy on Water Dispute With Syria Viewed [HURRIYET 26 Feb]	27
Turkey: NSC Advises Extension of State of Emergency [Ankara TV]	28
Turkey: Demirel Interviewed on New Coalition Effort [HURRIYET 26 Feb]	28

EU: Article Discusses Major Topics for IGC

BR2702160096 Paris *LES ECHOS* in French
27 Feb 96 p 4

[Article by Jean-Michel Lamy: "Major Maneuvering Before Start of Intergovernmental Conference"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The traditional French-German ministerial meeting is being held today in Freiburg. Klaus Kinkel and Herve de Charette, the two foreign ministers, will test out a number of cooperation arrangements — such as the construction of common embassies. But it will primarily be an occasion to fill in the details of the institutional approach decided on at the Baden-Baden summit in December 1995, in particular with the emphasis on extending the scope of decisionmaking to include decisions made by a qualified majority, a more visible Common Foreign and Security Policy [CFSP], and better harmonized relations between the European Parliament and the national parliaments. For its part, the Commission will tomorrow set out its official position on the Intergovernmental Conference [IGC]. It agrees with the French-German duo on majority voting and advocates the further integration of Community procedures in the future foreign policy. The debate on this point will be crucial.

The immediate challenge facing the IGC, to be launched with great pomp and ceremony by a European Council of the heads of state and government in Turin (Italy) on 29 March, will deal with defining the mandate given to the representatives of the 15 EU member states in charge of negotiating. Yesterday in Brussels the foreign ministers expressed their conviction that they would settle the mandate issue before 29 March without taking recourse to arbitration of a summit. In the medium term, the question will be to find out when the work will be finished. In principle, the goal is spring 1997. The difficulty will lie in reaching the unanimous vote required to conclude it. Because of this restriction, certain capitals are already forecasting crisis scenarios.

EMU Not on the Agenda

At the same time the Fifteen are emphasizing that Economic and Monetary Union [EMU] will not be on the agenda. At the very most it is admitted that the climate — be it bearish or bullish — at the Conference will have a negative impact on the single currency's chances. But everyone must know that if the deadline of 1 January 1999 is met, then genuine reform of the Union will be guaranteed.

So will the only challenges in Turin be merely superficial ones? The aim is to prepare the Union's decisionmaking system for enlargement. This presupposes a clearer distribution of roles among the Union's three

major poles: the Commission, which is advocating the widespread implementation of majority voting; the Parliament, which is demanding more co-decision powers, but which is laboring under the handicap of not being able to vote on taxes; and the Council of Ministers, which all member states — led by France — want to return to its main task of making decisions, or even taking initiatives. Out of these broad strokes, a sort of consensus — excepting the United Kingdom — is beginning to emerge on majority voting for economic matters and preventing paralysis. The refinements concern the weighting of the votes by demography or wealth. The Commission is even suggesting a two-spring system. On the other hand, the French presidential palace intends to strictly limit this majority procedure to economic and social issues. So that leaves two main areas where decisionmaking arrangements need to be found.

The "Community-ization" of Schengen

The first area is police and legal affairs. Naturally the Commission wants to "Community-ize" the Schengen agreement. France, working closely with Germany, is more open in this respect than one might think — on the issue of visas, for example.

Where police cooperation is concerned, on the other hand, the intergovernmental approach should constitute the rule, according to Paris. Any adjustments will be tricky to make.

The second area concerns the CFSP. Here, the French presidential office's strategy is very clear indeed. Priority goes to intergovernmental decisionmaking, with a desire to give genuine visibility to the action of the states via the appointment of a official at the Council in charge of these issues. Tomorrow the Commission, hostile to this possibility, will present a counterattack in the form of a Council-Commission cooperation proposal supported by a think tank of Community and government experts.

In fact, France is betting on the creation of a genuine autonomous European defense pole within NATO. This has the merit of justifying Paris' reintegration into the Atlantic alliance's bodies. German Chancellor Helmut Kohl does not deny this approach, even though he emphasizes the necessary integration of the Western European Union [WEU] (military germ of the EU) into the Union. This is not contradictory. In concrete terms, the military forces could wear WEU helmets within the framework of NATO.

On 3 February in Munich, the chancellor said: "We must think about giving the European Council the power to issue directives concerning the WEU and adopting a solidarity clause covering all the member states of

the Union similar to the assistance provided for in the treaties of Brussels and Washington. There can be no question of having one side take care of security and defense matters while the other takes care of trade."

Defense — The Main Challenge

Naturally defense could turn out to be the main challenge in Turin. If the EU — including the small countries — reaches agreement on the outlines of a European military expression, then Washington will sign the order to change the channels of command within NATO. On the other hand, should it prove impossible to reach agreement, then the single currency will no longer have its political-military balance. Chancellor Kohl let it be known that he would have trouble accepting that.

EU: Commission Paper Advocates Flexibility in EU
BR2702124996 Brussels EUROPEAN VOICE
in English 22-28 Feb 96 p2

[Report by Rory Watson: "Commission sets out IGC stall"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] A Systematic erosion of national vetos and explicit recognition that some member states can forge ahead without the rest are crucial to the EU's future, the European Commission argues in its draft submission to the Intergovernmental Conference.

The proposals, contained in a 19-page internal policy paper, are due to be unveiled to MEPs [Members of European Parliament] next Wednesday (28 February) immediately after being endorsed by the full Commission as it lays out its platform for the approaching negotiations on the reform of existing EU treaties.

Supporters of such fundamental changes in the way the Union has conducted its business over the past four decades insist they are essential if any substantial increase in the current membership is not to lead to paralysis.

The paper, *Strengthening Political Union and Preparing for Enlargement*, warns that the difficulties involved in securing unanimous agreement rise exponentially as more countries become involved. "Unanimity is not conceivable in the perspective of a substantial enlargement," it states categorically.

It throws down a second challenge to those governments opposing any major change in the status quo by insisting "the European Union must not be condemned to move forward at the speed of its slowest members".

Flexibility it says, is nothing new and is already practised by giving countries temporary exemptions or transition periods. It argues it should be possible for

countries wishing to go further and faster than others in policy cooperation to be able to do so.

Certain EU activities, such as the single market and accompanying social and environmental policies, would have to be applied by all members. But under the draft Commission proposals, some members could go further than others on economic issues, foreign and security policy, defence and internal security.

Support for such flexibility is already emerging from France. A leaked draft of the IGC strategy paper being prepared for French President Jacques Chirac indicates approval for the insertion of a general clause into the EU treaties enabling those countries wishing to strengthen cooperation to do so.

The Commission will press for the flexibility and majority voting principles to apply generally to the Union's external policy, but accepts that exceptions would have to be made when decisions involved military action or affected the essential and clearly defined interests of a member state.

In a bid to introduce greater coherence into EU foreign policy, it recommends that the country holding the rotating six-month presidency and the Commission should operate far more in tandem.

The draft opinion rejects the French idea repeated in the Elysee paper of appointing a Mr or Mrs Foreign Policy, but accepts that certain ad hoc tasks could be entrusted to specific personalities.

The Commission also recommends setting up an analysis unit to study foreign policy trends and help the Union anticipate and influence events outside its frontiers, rather than react to them, as at present.

The paper under examination also repeats Commission President Jacques Santer's calls for an increase in his powers over his colleagues. It recommends his successor should be able to play a determining role in choosing members of the college and suggests that while each country should have no more than one Commissioner, the president should in future have the power not to accept a member from each country.

The Commission draws attention to the practical day-to-day impact of a Union of up to 27 members where meetings will take longer and more languages be spoken. It argues that the current cumbersome decision-making procedures should be reduced from over 20 to just three and agrees with MEPs that the European Parliament should have no more than 700 members.

It also accepts that there may need to be a change in the way member states' votes are weighted in the Court of Ministers.

EU: New Legislation Seeks Irreversible Transition to Euro

BR2702144396 Brussels EUROPEAN VOICE
in English 22-28 Feb 96 p30

[Report by Tim Jones: "New Laws in Pipeline To Make Euro Watertight"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] New draft legislation from the European Commission aims to ensure that the transition to the single currency will be irreversible.

Officials inside DGII, the Directorate-General responsible for economic and financial affairs, are working flat out to deliver so-called 'secondary' legislation by early April on three areas where the Maastricht Treaty is silent.

These will establish the legal status of the Euro from the moment a monetary union is created until banknotes and coins are introduced, and ensure the continuity of contracts as well as a one-for-one swap of Ecus for Euros.

The last time the Commission carried out such an exercise was in 1993, when regulations were adopted banning central banks from granting overdrafts to governments and stopping the practice of forcing banks to hold public debt.

The underlying purpose is to seal all the possible cracks that could spook the fickle financial markets or give the impression of the transition itself as a toe-in-the-water exercise.

"The financial markets want certainty," says Graham Bishop, EU monetary expert at investment bank Salomon Brothers. "If politicians want to keep their currencies just in case the thing unravels, then we will know they are not to be trusted"

This applies most clearly to defining the status of the Euro while it remains a nebulous currency without physical cash changing hands.

Market logic suggests that, despite this, it will become increasingly important during the transition period from January 1999 to July 2002, assuming the single currency plan goes ahead in accordance with the Maastricht timetable.

From January 1999, the European Central Bank will only operate in Euro, so the money markets are likely to swap over to it, followed by the banks and the government bond markets. Then, multinationals, which account for 10% of cross-border trade in the EU, are likely to spot the cost-cutting benefits of using the Euro.

To provide these institutions with the certainty they need, the Commission will want to give true legal status

to the Euro. Officials may even specify that it is the only genuine currency and that the national units are subdenominations of it

Continuity of contracts is equally vital to the markets.

Failure to have watertight legislation may encourage both borrowers and lenders to use monetary union as an excuse for renegotiating contracts for loans, bonds, financial derivatives or insurance policies.

Although the Maastricht Treaty says financial contracts will continue - since the value of the capital must be translated into Euro at the exchange rate fixed at the point of transition - it does not talk about the interest rate. This means that contracting parties may be tempted to renegotiate.

Borrowers who raised cash in a high interest rate currency may argue that, since their liabilities will be in the Euro from day one, they should pay interest at the lower rate, while lenders in low interest rate currencies may start to demand interest at the higher Euro rate.

This inherent conflict of interest could unleash a flood of litigation, Barclays Bank's EU specialist and former DGII official Malcolm Levitt warned in a recent report.

Without EU-level legislation, member states could come to different legal conclusions.

While these issues concern events three years away, the question of whether an existing Ecu can be exchanged at parity for a Euro is of immediate concern to the Ecu bond market, which now totals 115 billion ecu.

Uncertainty over this issue despite the pledge of the December Madrid summit to carry out a one-for-one swap, continues to trouble the market.

Once the drafting is complete, the Commission will forward the proposals to the Council of Ministers, Parliament and the European Monetary Institute.

However, since some of the legal basis for ratification does not kick-in until the short-list for Euro membership is drawn up, final adoption may have to wait until 1998.

EU To Examine Harmonization of Tax on Savings

BR2702145696 Brussels EUROPEAN VOICE
in English 22-28 Feb 96 p3

[Report by Tim Jones: "Savings Taxation Rears Its Head Again"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Having been hidden away for over a year, one of the EU's oldest financial chestnuts is about to be revived - but with virtually no chance of success.

The Italian presidency wants to breathe life back into a seven-year-old proposal for harmonising the Union's diverse systems for taxing interest from savings and hopes to rekindle the debate at the next meeting of finance ministers on 11 March. It will be the first time the issue has been discussed since the presidencies of Germany and Belgium tried to win over reluctant colleagues to the idea in 1993 and 1994.

While many countries were merely sceptical, the UK and Luxembourg were adamantly opposed. The UK jealously guards its fiscal sovereignty and the pre-eminence of the City of London as a magnet for foreign savings, while Luxembourg's zero savings tax rate and banking secrecy are the basis of the Grand Duchy's wealth.

The debate goes back to 1989, when the Commission came up with a proposal for a common system of withholding tax on interest income, largely at the instigation of the French. They felt that having a single market and free capital movement together with varied tax and bank secrecy regimes was bound to cause distortions.

Withholding tax rates in the Union vary from zero to 30% and most countries which deduct tax at source from residents' savings exempt the savings of non-residents. This has created a major headache for both Belgium and Germany as Luxembourg in particular, but also Switzerland, benefit from their neighbours' rising rates of taxation on savings.

In 1993, Belgium came up with a compromise proposal to allow the co-existence of two systems: one withholding tax from savings at the point of payment and another forcing banks to inform tax authorities of any interest paid to savers.

Germany's Theo Waigel tried again in late 1994, but made little headway, acknowledging that the EU would

only be able to create a common system in consultation with Switzerland and other members of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.

But tax avoidance is becoming a hot issue in Germany. Tax experts believe as much as 150 billion ecu has been salted away in tax refuges in Luxembourg, Switzerland, Austria and Liechtenstein, with the loss of 10 billion ecu in tax to the German government.

Commission officials report a shift in attitudes since 1994, as member states contemplate the possibility of similar losses of tax revenue. But the problem, as always, will be the UK and Luxembourg. As long as taxation issues require unanimity, two countries or even one small grand duchy with a strategic interest in keeping a competitive edge in the market for Europe's cash, will block the plan.

EU: France, Germany Seek Security Clause in Maastricht

*LD2802120996 Paris France-2 Teletext in French
2028 GMT 27 Feb 96*

[FBIS Translated Text] Germany and France are proposing that a "political solidarity clause" in security and defense matters involving EU countries be written into the Maastricht Treaty.

This suggestion is included in a document published on Tuesday [27 February] in Freiburg following a Franco-German ministerial meeting of the two countries' foreign ministers.

Messrs de Charette and Kinkel also make several proposals which aim to give the EU a real foreign policy, "which is something it lacks at the moment."

UK: Rifkind on Reform of European Court of Human Rights

MS2802103896 London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH
in English 28 Feb 96 p 11

[Report by Adrian Porter: "European Court Call for Reform by Rifkind"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Strasbourg — Plans for a reform of the way in which the European Court of Human Rights approaches its judgment of cases affecting Britain were set out yesterday by Malcolm Rifkind, the Foreign Secretary.

At a meeting with Daniel Tarschys, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe which oversees the Strasbourg based Court, Mr Rifkind outlined the Government's views on possible changes to the system.

His action follows the outcry in Britain over recent decisions against the Government. The latest was a ruling that the Home Secretary had no right to determine how long juveniles should be detained after the minimum or "tariff" part of their sentence had expired.

The main point in Mr Rifkind's memorandum concerns the nomination and appointment of judges who are drawn from the 38 member countries of the Council of Europe.

The Government wants a new system of informal consultation with other countries to allow proper screening of people before they are even nominated as judges.

According to Council of Europe officials in Strasbourg, Britain is not seeking a power of veto over the selection of judges, partly because such a sanction might be used against its own nominees.

Mr Rifkind is also seeking to ensure that judges take account of a country's social historical and constitutional background in making their decisions.

UK: UVF Prepared for Bloody Response to IRA

MS2702153396 Belfast BELFAST SUNDAY LIFE
in English 25 Feb 96 p 6

["Exclusive" report by Alan Murray: "UVF Hardliners Armed for Action"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The UVF [Ulster Volunteer Force] has reorganised its military command in preparation for a bloody response to any renewed IRA campaign in Northern Ireland.

Security sources say the outlawed loyalist group, which has access to commercial explosives and detonators, is being controlled by more hardline elements in the wake of the London bombings.

And while details of the changes are sketchy, police believe they are highly significant, and indicate a definite UVF intent to respond to the next IRA outrage.

Intelligence reports have indicated increased activity within UVF circles in the last fortnight, with particular movement in the greater Belfast area.

Mid-Ulster units are also believed to be monitoring the situation and would also respond immediately to any attack in Northern Ireland.

Activists in Belfast have become increasingly angered at comments made by Progressive Unionist Party spokesmen who have represented their views since the 1994 ceasefire.

Slogans undermining their positions have appeared on gable walls in different parts of Belfast in the last fortnight.

While the Combined Loyalist Military Command decided not to issue a statement following a meeting last week, many UVF activists are pressing for a loyalist response to the next IRA attack wherever it takes place.

"There have been changes at the military end and there's a harder element in charge. What they will do after a further IRA attack we can only guess," one security source said.

On Friday troops returned to the streets of Northern Ireland to accompany RUC [Royal Ulster Constabulary] patrols and guard security bases in anticipation of IRA and retaliatory loyalist attacks in the coming days.

Security analysts believe that while the IRA has remained "on hold" in the province since the Canary Wharf atrocity, it is now in a position to resume a campaign here.

The position of the UDA [Ulster Defense Association] in response to a further IRA attack in Britain or Ulster is less clear.

Its leadership remains intact and it may not sanction retaliatory attacks unless members are directly targeted.

"As far as we are concerned it remains a 'hold the fort' situation," one leading figure in the UDA said yesterday.

UK: Paisley on Cease-Fire, Peace Process Prospects

MS2702151396 Belfast BELFAST TELEGRAPH
in English 26 Feb 96 p 15

[Article by Ian Paisley, leader of the Progressive Unionist Party "The Truth About 'The Peace'"]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] On BBC Radio Ulster [Sinn Féin vice president] Martin McGuinness said that Ian

Paisley had engaged in violence during the 18 months of the so-called ceasefire. This is the old IRA game of *félon settin* — we name them, you hate them.

The facts are, the two parties to the ceasefire, IRA/Sinn Féin and the loyalist paramilitaries, were both engaged in continual violence during the ceasefire.

There were more brutal punishment beatings each week of the ceasefire than at any time before the ceasefire. Eight people were murdered by the IRA along with a number of people murdered by loyalists. These are the inescapable truths which expose the ceasefire as phoney and the peace as a hoax.

When further questioned by Jim Dougal on Saturday, Martin McGuinness said that the unionist leaders were engaged in violence in order to refuse Sinn Féin/IRA their right to enter all-party talks.

Those with guns, to quote John Hume, "on the table, under the table, or outside the door", and using them in acts of savage killings, have no right to be at the table at all, mandate or no mandate.

I wonder why all the Paramilitaries, on both sides, fight so hard against an election. Has the majority of the people of Ulster not the right to say who should be there and who should not be there? It is our country and our future. It is not for the paramilitaries to dictate the terms and conditions wherein the future must be decided.

Leadership, according to Billy Hutchinson of the PUP (Progressive Unionist Party), must be demonstrated by negotiating with murderous gunmen in suits, and he attempts to don the mantle of Mandela and 'Arafat in Northern Ireland.

What Hutchinson doesn't want to know is that the majority of the people of Ulster want, not only the surrender of the IRA murder weapons, but the surrender of the murder weapons of those for whom he poses to speak.

To hear the 'loyalist' paramilitaries singing off the same hymn sheet as Sinn Féin/IRA is disgusting, especially when it is accompanied by David Ervine's yelp: "I am prepared to give Gerry Adams the benefit of the doubt". Who does he think he is speaking for?

Does he forget who carried the coffin of the IRA thug who was responsible for the massacre on the Shankill Road? As an elected representative for the Shankill in the European Parliament, I would inform him that my constituents have no doubts about Mr Adams.

The Sinn Féin/IRA ending of their so-called 'military hostilities' was a ploy and not a genuine peace initiative. Some of us were not prepared to be taken in by the IRA's lies.

The ceasefire was the substitution, for a short time, of the TAS (Total Armed Struggle) with what republicans call the TUAS (total Unarmed Struggle). I warned from the very beginning that the IRA were only interested in a ceasefire for as long as they got concessions. Once those concessions appeared to have dried up the ceasefire would end.

Sinn Féin spokesmen in September 1994 are on record as stating that "peace is not a principle, only a tactic". The tactic has resorted back to war.

The reason for the ceasefire was spelt out in a Sinn Féin/IRA paper in September 1994. The reasons given then for TUAS were as follows:

- "The Republican Movement on its own does not have the support to achieve its goal. It is the first time in 25 years that all the major Irish parties are rowing in roughly the same direction".

- "The IRA must develop an Irish Nationalist consensus with American support. Dublin's coalition is the strongest government in 25 years or more. Reynolds has no historical baggage to hinder him and knows how popular such a consensus would be among grassroots".

- "The IRA must effect an international perception that Republicanism is reasonable".

- "Clinton is perhaps the first U.S. President in decades to be substantially influenced by such a lobby".

- "An anti-British movement must be mobilised throughout the world. At this time the British Government is the least popular in the EU".

- "Hume is the only SDLP person strong enough to face the challenge".

The duration of the TUAS was only for as long as it was achieving the same end as the Armed Struggle. When it failed to deliver it would be, substituted once again.

The harnessing of an 'anti-imperialist' peace movement heavily peppered with the Sinn Féin/IRA posters — "All Party Talks Now" was witnessed yesterday.

Sincere seekers of peace are wittingly or unwittingly helping Sinn Féin/IRA to carry out their plan already revealed to their members in their briefing paper referred to above. Imagine the affrontery of Sinn Féin calling on people to support the peace rallies while at the same time encouraging the IRA to engage in more violence.

My party expressed the folly of giving Senator Mitchell, Clinton's appointee, a role in Ulster's affairs. Those who backed the internationalisation of the disarmament of terrorists probably did a great injury to the process towards real peace.

Now the IRA, who have not accepted the watered down and incomplete Mitchell Report, cry for it to be elevated to a place of absolute sovereignty.

The Mitchell Report has no standing. Mitchell and his colleagues were afraid to grasp the nettle of the problem they were given to solve. The IRA and Clinton want Mitchell to be elevated to the position of an envoy and to have, along with the Kennedy lobby, power to interfere in Northern Ireland's internal affairs.

Speaking in the House of Commons in what was a most passionate and historic speech, Seamus Mallon, a Devout republican, exposed the mentality of Sinn Féin/IRA. His words should be carefully noted:

"The British will always be wrong; no matter what they do, IRA/Sinn Féin will have a reason to say that. The British can be plausible, easy to populist, but they will be wrong. The Irish Government will be wrong, as they are at the moment.

"I take this opportunity to say at the moment that I support the stance taken by the Irish Government. They are the Sovereign Government of the Republic of Ireland and I totally support their stance of not speaking at ministerial or governmental level with people who are connected with violence.

"However, they are wrong too and we are wrong. I remember when, not so long ago, we were [Lundies] and sell-outs, and I was a West Brit.

"In the mind of the IRA everything was changed except the dogma — I refer to the great line by Wilfred Owen: 'It is a good and noble thing to die for one's country'.

"IRA members believe that somehow they hold the Holy Grail and that all the rest of the people in Ireland, including nationalists and real republicans, are wrong".

If the whole of nationalist Ireland is wrong, according to the IRA, then the only way to silence the IRA guns is to surrender to them or militarily defeat them.

If the IRA are as they claim, as Mr Mallon maintains — and I for one don't doubt him, — the sole holders of the Holy Grail of Nationalism who will not even agree with their fellow nationalists in the Irish Forum, established to achieve a 'nationalist consensus', what hope would unionists have in talks?

Having consigned their fellow nationalists to a political purgatory they would, most certainly, consign unionists to a political Hell.

The people must be given the right to speak. Hume says let them speak through a referendum. If that is to be so, should not the first question in any referendum be 'Do

the people want Northern Ireland to remain an integral part of the Union?'.

The power to ask that question is enshrined in statute. As the object of the IRA campaign is to destroy the Union that must be the vital question to top any referendum. What is more, the answer to that question would put negotiations into the right perspective.

Mr Hume wants a referendum in the South. Should not the first question in that referendum be on the immoral, criminal and illegal territorial claim in Articles 2 and 3 of their 1937 Constitution?

Meaningless and unclear questions such as 'do you want peace?' or 'do you want all-party talks?', only beg the question.

No, what is needed is an election to a Northern Ireland Forum which can become the negotiating body for the Ulster people. A public forum is necessary to inject democracy into the whole process, bolstered by up-to-date mandates.

The representation of the people of Northern Ireland must be the driving force in any solution that can have a chance of succeeding.

UK: Hume on Talks With Major, All-Party Talks

LD2702134896 London BBC Television Network
in English 1300 GMT 27 Feb 96

[Interview with John Hume, leader of the Social Democratic and Labour Party, by correspondent Edward Stourton—live]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] [Stourton] We return to our top story, because as we reported earlier, John Hume, the SDLP [Social Democratic and Labour Party] leader, has been meeting the prime minister. He has just emerged and he joins us now. Mr. Hume, how did you get on?

[Hume] Well, we had a meeting with the prime minister about the current situation, and are very encouraged with the fact that he made very, very clear to us that his primary objective is to fix a very firm date for all-party talks and for substantive negotiations. And of course that is something we want to see happen as soon as possible, because we believe that we can restore the peace process, if that is the case. And what's happening now, of course, is that he is consulting with the different parties and with the Irish Government as to the means of and the process of arriving at that date.

[Stourton] Would it be fair to say that you are becoming slightly more flexible on the question of an election?

[Hume] I don't know when I was ever inflexible. We have said repeatedly from the beginning, and we've

been saying from the first, from the cease-fire of 18 months ago — we've been saying that the next stage has got to be all-party talks. We wanted that to happen many months ago. We still want it to happen as soon as possible. On the question of elections, we're told that the reason that those who asked for an election, [changes thought] We don't think it's necessary to have an election in order to have all-party talks, because all parties can be called to talks tomorrow. But if an election is necessary, and the purpose of it is to have a mandate, we suggest that the people of Northern Ireland as a whole would be the electorate: inter-electorate, and that they would vote for whatever party they wish to represent them at the table.

[Sturaton] What's changed your mind about that then? Because on this program about a week ago, you were extremely down on the idea of elections. Now you seem to be accepting that they are possible.

[Hume] I was extremely down and I'm still very down on an election to elect 80 people — having elections in every constituency — not only is that very divisive, it's a system that is... [changes thought] It's a method that will produce the dialogue totally unnecessarily, and if the purpose of an election is to give mandates to parties, then let the people go out and vote for whichever party they wish to represent them, and based on the percentage that they get, they send their delegation to the table, not to an assembly.

[Sturaton] And if it's done like that, you'd be prepared to go along with it?

[Hume] We have made that very clear to the prime minister, yes.

[Sturaton] Mr. Hume, thanks very much indeed for joining us.

UK: Major, Bruton Agree to Peace Summit in London

LD/280/284996. London PRESS ASSOCIATIONS in English 18:17 GMT 28 Feb 96

[By Sarah Womack and Chris Parker, PA News]

[FBI's Transcribed Text] John Major and Irish Premier John Bruton agreed late last night to a summit in London aimed at kickstarting the peace process which was shattered when the IRA Dickson's Month ended the 17-month ceasefire.

After two phone calls, the two leaders agreed a plan to be unveiled at a joint news conference after the 12:40 pm meeting today (Wednesday). It is to begin the process.

They appeared to be edging towards setting a date for all-party talks, which now look likely to follow elections of some sort in the province. Nationalist SDLP (Social Democrat Liberal Party) leader John Hume emerged from Downing Street earlier, saying Mr Major was seeking to agree a date for inclusive talks.

"What he is working out at the moment, which involves talking to ourselves, the other parties and the Irish Government, is creating the means whereby we can arrive at that date and those all-party negotiations," Mr Hume said.

And Mr Bruton, addressing the Irish Parliament, said he believed a "convergence of views" was emerging between London and Dublin on how progress could be made "in the context of agreement on a specific date for negotiations".

Contact between Mr Bruton and Mr Major followed round-the-clock efforts between constitutional parties and officials of the two governments — overshadowed at Westminster by the row over whether Ulster Unionists sought to strike a bargain with Mr Major in return for support on the Scott report vote.

Mr Major must now settle with the parties what form elections to a negotiating body in the province must take.

Meanwhile, Dublin has been pressing for preliminary talks — similar to those which produced the Belfast peace — with Sinn Féin representatives in one room and other parties' members in other rooms.

But progress hangs on a resumption of the IRA ceasefire. A condition for the restoration of the ceasefire is thought to be the setting of a date for all-party talks. And until the ceasefire resumes Sinn Féin will be excluded from talks at ministerial level.

Hardline Democratic Unionist leader Dr Ian Paisley emerged from talks with Mr Major last night saying that while the Prime Minister's aim was to have all-party talks, there is a difficulty with who all the parties are.

At the present time, the British Government is not talking ministerially to IRA/Sinn Féin, neither is the Dublin Government.

I put it to him: "Are you going to betray that? Are you going to talk to Sinn Féin, and is the Dublin Government?" He said: "Certainly not, until they fulfil their obligations and have a complete and total ceasefire."

Pressed about Mr Hume's suggestion that Mr Major might consider a date for all-party talks, Dr Paisley said: "I know what the Prime Minister said is, and at the present time, to suggest Sinn Féin be included

to a meeting ... there would be more absentees than ever, because the British Government could not go, the Dublin Government could not go, and we certainly wouldn't."

At around 11 pm last night, Mr Major and Mr Bruton were still attempting to put together arrangements for the summit meeting after a long-awaited 15-minute telephone conversation.

After the call between Downing Street and Dublin, Irish sources said there would be further telephone contact between the two leaders "very soon".

Shortly after midnight, Downing Street confirmed that a second phone call had taken place, and the summit had been agreed.

In Dublin, scheduling difficulties were said to have been responsible for a several hours-long delay in establishing telephone link during the evening between the two leaders.

Indications were that late snags prevented the two prime ministers signalling the go ahead for their summit earlier in the evening.

According to some observers, these centred on Dublin's insistence that a specific date had to be fixed for the start of all-party negotiating on the future of Northern Ireland before they approved the summit plan.

UK: Likely Agenda for Major, Bruton Summit

LD2802124096 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 0448 GMT 28 Feb 96

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The main points the Downing Street summit will discuss must cover the views of all the parties north and south of the Irish border as well as Whitehall. The likely details of the communique could include:

- A date for all-party talks, following elections of some sort in Ulster.

- The IRA must re-introduce a complete and total ceasefire.

- There is also likely to be room for the Bosnia-style 'proximity talks' plan put forward by Dublin, as well as a scheme for peace-and-talks referendums on both sides of the Irish border, the brainchild of Northern Ireland's Social Democratic and Labour Party leader, John Hume.

- Elections to go ahead before all-party talks — possibly in tandem with referendums — but be followed almost instantly by the inclusive discussions.

The SDLP (Social Democratic and Labour Party) and the DUP (Democratic Unionist Party) want elections carried out on a proportional representation system, with Ulster treated as a single constituency, as happens in polls for the Brussels parliament.

The Ulster Unionists want elections along Westminster lines based on 18 constituencies and run on the first-past-the-post system — giving their party an inbuilt majority.

UK: Adams Discusses Conditions for IRA Cease-Fire

LD2802124096 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 1228 GMT 28 Feb 96

[FBIS Transcribed Text] The peace process has reached a 'defining moment', Sinn Fein leader Gerry Adams said today.

But he refused to speculate whether the deal hammered out between London and Dublin would be enough to persuade the IRA to call a new ceasefire.

Mr Adams said a specific date for all-party negotiations — expected to be announced in Downing Street later today — was crucial as the next step in reviving the province's damaged peace process.

He told reporters in republican west Belfast, "What Sinn Fein wants to see is a beginning of inclusive talks, declared to begin on a fixed, specific, firm date without any ambiguities of language... and all the stalling and spinning out that the British government have engaged in."

"Whether that's enough for the IRA, that is a matter for the IRA. As far as Sinn Fein is concerned we will come to all of this positively."

"I think we are at a very defining moment in our history, that in the battle for ideas we have to assert the centrality of dialogue, honest dialogue."

Sinn Fein leaders claim they need firm public assurances that full negotiations will get under way quickly before they can approach the IRA to seek a new truce. But Mr Adams refused to say if an announcement of a firm date for all-party talks would be enough to make him make a fresh peace approach to the IRA.

"There are two elements to all of this. There's first of all (a need) to get a political package which actually puts the peace process back on the rails. That's a matter for the political parties, which includes Sinn Fein."

"The second part is whether those who are engaged in armed action will seek to enhance that. At the moment I am not going to speculate until I see exactly what is going to be unveiled by the Taoiseach (Mr Bruton) and the Prime Minister."

Mr Adams also reiterated his 'implacable' opposition to elections, details of which are also expected to be announced later today.

Germany: Kohl Gives 'Situation Report' on Moscow Visit*AU2702161196 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 27 Feb 96 p 4)*

[Report by "fy": "Taking Russia's Interests Into Consideration"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] At a meeting of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) Executive Committee on Monday (26 February), Chancellor Kohl pointed out the need to consider Russia's security interests on a par with those of other countries of central and eastern Europe. In his situation report, Kohl, who had visited Russian President Yeltsin in Moscow a few days previously, said that NATO's expansion must not be subject to undue criticism. "Although Russia has no right to veto the NATO admission of other countries, it would be politically unwise to disregard Russian interests," said Kohl. He said he is convinced that Yeltsin will continue his reform course and bring the Chechen conflict to a peaceful conclusion before the presidential election.

The chancellor expressed his satisfaction with French President Chirac's decision to eliminate the "Hades" short-range nuclear missiles. This missile has a range of 150 km, and, launched from France's eastern borders, would have hit only German targets. Kohl said that with his decision, Chirac has responded to a request from the German Government. Despite the French decision to abolish compulsory military service, the abolition of military service in Germany did not encounter any support during the Committee's talks. This service has proved itself, it was said. No support was expressed for the idea of a professional army.

Kohl reiterated that he wishes to adhere to the schedule and criteria of European economic and monetary union. From the German angle, he said, the purpose of the Maastricht review conference in June 1997 is to reach an agreement on transferring foreign and security policy, the combating of crime, asylum policy, and refugee policy from the responsibility of individual EU countries to the responsibility of the EU Commission, thus turning these spheres into a common sphere of tasks. [passage omitted]

Germany: De Charette Speaks to Chambers of Industry, Commerce*BR2702141496 (Internet) French Ministry of Foreign Affairs WWW in French 22 Feb 96*

[Speech by French Foreign Minister Herve de Charette to the German Chambers of Industry and Commerce in Bonn on 22 February 1996]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am very grateful to the German Chambers of Industry and Commerce for giving me the opportunity to speak to an audience that is so well informed

about the subject of Europe and Franco-German relations.

I am especially pleased since we have entered into a new and certainly difficult phase of the European construction and since, as usual, it is Germany's and France's responsibility to join their efforts to conceive of the projects of tomorrow, as they have always succeeded in doing in the past. [passage omitted]

Since you have invited me, I would like to explain to you the project which France would like to develop with Germany in this decisive phase of the European construction. [passage omitted]

Europe Must Also Be Competent in the Political Area

France and Germany, at the initiative of Chancellor Kohl and Jacques Chirac, have together defined their common goals for the Intergovernmental Conference (IGC) in Turin.

This is indeed an issue related to political competence. We must indeed acknowledge that the European institutions are functioning in a mediocre fashion — and I am once again being lenient in saying so — and that they risk being paralyzed if Europe enlarges again without jointly adopting the necessary preliminary reforms. There is a genuine risk of a generalized institutional blockage. This is without doubt the last occasion for us to make the necessary decisions. Afterward, it will be too late, since no one can make me believe that 20 members will be able to decide what 15 cannot.

What reforms do we need?

To welcome the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and defend ourselves against international competition, Europe must be strong.

This requires that our institutions acquire greater legitimacy and decisionmaking power. This is the whole of what is at stake at the IGC.

Europe will become more popular if those responsible for representing it are elected democratically. I shall say little on this here, since you have a good voting system. At the IGC, however, we will prepare a voting system either like the British one or like yours, but certainly not a national voting system which amounts to appointment by apparatchiks. Naturally, it is the job of the European Parliament to ensure democratic control over Community decisions, but it must also win the people's support. Legitimacy springs from the personal relationship between the elected deputy and the citizens. This justifies a reform of the voting system.

Europe's democratic legitimacy will also require a more balanced weighting of votes in Council decisions, a more transparent decisionmaking processes, and full respect for the principle of subsidiarity. We can no longer afford that public opinion has the impression that Europe can decide everything for everyone.

Democratic legitimacy also arises from full involvement of national parliaments in the decisionmaking process. You know France's proposal. It is simple: To create a consultative body in which national parliaments can express their opinion.

Europe will be strong if it is able to make decisions. The extension of qualified majority voting will contribute to this. Can it still be imagined that an EU decision is made by unanimity when the EU comprises 25 to 30 member states?

Europe will be strong if the Commission is strong. This occurs by means of a smaller-size Commission, whose members should not exceed that of the Union's major functions and whose president will have more authority through the power to form and, if necessary, dissolve his team. This is not the case at present.

We must return to the idea of the founding fathers and break with the idea that all member states must be represented in the Commission. In making this proposal, France is prepared to accept not being represented in this new Commission.

And finally, a strong and legitimate Europe is one which assures citizens' liberty and security.

Europe's citizens expect us to tackle the problem of their security head-on. They expect Europe to resolve the serious issue of migration flows at the European level.

The free movement of persons cannot be guaranteed until we have a common policy on the fight against drugs, organized crime, or money laundering. We need more cooperation and coordination. We want a Europe which is stronger and more democratic, and it is in this spirit that we are going to the IGC.

In particular, we will need new legal instruments and decisionmaking processes allowing texts to be adopted more rapidly. We also need to increase the involvement of national parliaments in fields which affect basic freedoms.

A stronger, more democratic Europe: That is our ambition. Is it unreasonable? I do not believe so. The IGC generates little enthusiasm, but it is necessary. The future of Europe depends on it. (passage omitted)

We Also Want a Europe Which is Present in the World and Which Ensures Its Own Security

1) We laid out the project in the Maastricht Treaty, but we must admit that the results are not satisfactory.

The Yugoslav drama has furnished a tragic proof of this. Our differences of analysis have contributed to complicating a settlement of the crisis. The absence of political will on the part of the EU has done the rest.

Our voice does not make itself heard where we would like it to be. In Asia, in South America, in the Near and Middle East — in fact, throughout the world, no country looks at each of our countries in isolation; they expect a European presence, a strong presence, a message, a genuine international EU policy, one which can serve as a counterweight to the U.S. presence which many consider to be invasive, and which no one wishes to be exclusive.

Yes, but do we genuinely want it?

France, at any rate, proposes it. And it is first of all from Germany that it hopes to receive a response. It is not only Europe which expects the Franco-German couple to show the way, but the entire world. I have heard this expressed very clearly in China and in the Near East.

Europe's presence in the world must thus be given a political content and a new impetus. That is exactly the goal of President Chirac's and Chancellor Kohl's proposal to create a new function at the EU level expressing the common position of the 15 member states to the outside world.

2) At the same time, we must seize the opportunity provided to us by the new geostrategic configuration of the new Europe to organize — finally — the European defense identity.

Europeans today need a military instrument capable of extending their foreign policy. The WEU (Western European Union) is the first stone of this instrument. We must strengthen its operational capabilities and make it a genuine European pillar within the Atlantic alliance. The renovation of NATO gives us the opportunity to do so. France is prepared to play a full role within NATO, as I said in Brussels on 5 December. We must move forward, and we must do so quickly. I hope that the alliance's next ministerial meeting in Berlin will enable us to approve the guidelines and the precise timetable of this renovation, in the same way that I would like to see the IGC adopt the necessary measures allowing the emergence of a European defense identity.

In parallel with this, our countries' defense tools must be radically adapted to conduct missions required by the

new European situation. France is currently reforming its Armed Forces, reducing its size, professionalizing it, and making it more immediately available for crisis management. This development must be accompanied by a strengthening of Franco-German military cooperation: It is indeed together that our two countries will act to prevent the appearance of new crises in Europe and give Europe the military credibility it is lacking today. We have laid the foundations by creating the Eurocorps and, more recently, the weapons agency and the military observation system (Helios 2).

Of course, the construction of a European defense system leads to the question of nuclear forces. France has signaled its willingness to undertake a dialogue with its partners on this issue. The idea of concerted deterrence advanced by France's prime minister proceeds from a double observation: Nuclear deterrence remains an important element of Europe's security; and any potential aggressor who would want to encroach upon Europe's vital security interests will have to take into consideration the existence of French and British nuclear forces which, we propose, could make a major contribution to European security, according to new rules and to the extent that our partners desire.

Allow me to stress the relevance of recent statements by Chancellor Kohl: EU membership creates a *de facto* solidarity. Allow me to add that the construction of a genuine European defense system will inevitably raise the problem of the neutrality status which certain EU members have wanted to preserve. [passage omitted]

It seems obvious to me that Germany and France are called upon to participate in each of these strengthened bodies. The Franco-German entente remains more than ever the condition for a united Europe.

France and Germany, together with other countries, will once again have to fulfill their founding mission in Europe during the years to come. I have not a shadow of a doubt about it.

The Franco-German relationship, on which so many things depend, is the joint enterprise which has brought our two countries together for more than 40 years. Our reconciliation after centuries of war, an event without precedent in European history, has given birth to an entirely original type of dialogue. In reality, its principle is very simple: It is based on the shared will to come as close to each other as possible, to settle all issues of mutual interest through a permanent dialogue. And we have succeeded in this.

This desire to move forward together, which has become the basic principle of the European project, has borne

so many fruits that it has become a sort of reference model.

This does not mean that nothing may be touched upon between us, far from it. Germany and France are also changing. Germany's reunification, of course, is one of the major events of this end of the century, and with the disappearance of the Iron Curtain Germany has recovered its full place at the center of the Continent. We are fully aware of this. [passage omitted]

France, for its part, must also adapt, not without pain, to the political, social, and economic changes. Today the Franco-German relationship has become less exclusive and therefore more balanced from both the economic and the political standpoint.

More than ever our cooperation is crucial in achieving a European equilibrium, because we represent two major complementary currents of the European heritage. [passage omitted]

Ladies and gentlemen, at the beginning of a new seven-year presidential term in France, a time when foreign policy, which depends on the president of the Republic, is being established, I would like to express to you today President Chirac's desire to contribute, together with Chancellor Kohl thanks to their joint commitment, to the success of the European project.

We shall endeavor to translate this will into the daily action of our two governments. The remarkable results of the last summit at Baden-Baden bear witness to the progress achieved in all the fields of Franco-German cooperation.

A veritable laboratory of Europe, the Franco-German relationship should develop through systematic coordination at the earliest possible stage on all EU issues. But it can also bear fruit in other important areas. I will cite a few examples which are on the agenda of the second ministerial seminar which I will hold with my German counterpart and friend Klaus Kinkel in Freiburg within a few days.

For example, we have launched:

- A joint project concerning the safety of nuclear power plants in Central and Eastern Europe, a vital issue for our fellow citizens;
- A closer collaboration between our diplomatic, consular, and cultural representations abroad, going as far as joint missions; why not have one Franco-German policy in Asia?
- Initiatives which can bring our societies closer together, including professional mobility through the

mutual recognition of qualifications, and generalized teaching of each other's languages.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

A few months ago, I proposed a new Franco-German confidence pact for building the new Europe.

I have attempted to define the contents of this pact for you today.

But the main thing is trust. So, in conclusion, I have but a single message to give you: Our determination remains unshakable. How about you? We trust you; you can trust us.

Germany: Discussion Following De Charette Chambers Speech

BR2702145496 (Internet) French Ministry of Foreign Affairs WWW in French 27 Feb 96

[Answers by French Foreign Minister Herve de Charette to questions from the audience following his speech at the German Chambers of Industry and Commerce in Bonn on 22 February 1996]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] [Question] Mister Minister, you have insisted on the need to do everything possible to bring about the introduction of the European currency by the scheduled date. The present situation leads us to fear that neither France, nor Germany, nor other countries will be in a position to fulfill the convergence criteria. In this case, do you believe that it would be preferable to put back the implementation date of the single European currency by one or two years or to relax the entry criteria?

[De Charette] I would like not to discuss the dilemma which you have in mind. Politicians rarely like to respond to possible hypotheses about the future. The fact is that you are assuming that our countries will not be ready by the deadline. I do not believe this. I believe that our countries are in a position to meet the deadline. And I have expressed, firmly it seems to me, the French Government's intention and determination to do what has to be done to achieve this. As far as we are concerned, we have just one problem — and it is not a small one — that of the budget deficit.

We have taken the necessary steps, we have developed a work program which provides for a three-stage reduction of this budget deficit. We have already achieved the first stage, we will achieve the second this year, and it is important that we achieve the third one in 1997.

We are going to stick to this. And I want the German people to be very convinced that France is absolutely determined to do what has to be done to meet its commitments. This is not like a drawing one does on

blackboard. It is a treaty we have signed. The duty of major nations, and of others also, is to respect their signatures. We are committed, and this commitment comes into effect on 1 January 1999. We shall be there and I am sure that you will be there as well. [passage omitted]

[Question] France, together with Germany and others, has decided to maintain a military presence in Bosnia for one year. Here in Germany, but also in Great Britain, we are being told that this commitment will end after one year, as America manifestly still wants. What will France's attitude be if — as cannot be excluded — a military presence still appears necessary one year on, and if the United States is not ready to extend its commitment? For you, Minister, would we then be in a situation where the alliance's European pillar would have to intervene? Would you be ready to plead for Europeans to continue the action, even if the Americans no longer wanted to be in the game?

[De Charette] The present situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina is cause for concern. I say so frankly. It is cause for concern in many ways, but mainly because the application of the peace agreements is running into increasing difficulties. We are seeing this at Mostar, in conditions which I find unacceptable. We are getting ready to see this at Sarajevo, where I observe, and deplore, that both the Serbian and the Bosnian sides appear to be accepting the prospect of a mass exodus of the Serbian population from Sarajevo. We see incidents multiply. I observe that the refugee issue is not solved at all and that, ultimately, none of the three parties appears to have any intention of settling it in any way. In short, I believe that the international community has made a lot of efforts, but that the three parties concerned must remember that peace and that the future — their future — is first of all in their hands.

We have agreed that, within the framework of the Security Council resolutions, NATO will be present on the ground in a very impressive fashion, since it is the first time since the World War II that it has undertaken such a large-scale effort. On the military level we have decided to do so for one year. I do not see any reason to change this deadline. For a time I believed that the Americans could have envisaged remaining for a year and leaving us to finish the job. What I have to say mainly is this: the Serbians, Bosnians, and Croats must remember that the commitment, availability, and sacrifices made by the international community have been made without counting the cost, have been made voluntarily, and that ultimately their destiny is in their own hands, and that it is up to them to prove that they want to live together. Today I want to say that this

issue has not yet received the full response which we are entitled to hear. [passage omitted]

Germany: General Views Disadvantages of Professional Army

AU2702171296 Berlin DIE WELT in German
27 Feb 96 p 4

[Article by General Helge Hansen, commander-in-chief of the NATO Armed Forces in Central Europe: "Many Reasons Speak Against a Professional Army"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The question of "professional army or army of conscripts" has politico-strategic, economic, and social policy aspects. Here, the question of what other states do with their armies because of their specific security interests and traditions is not decisive for Germany, but only our security interests, the economic productivity of our society, and the question of the allocation of armed forces in our state are relevant.

It is indisputable that there is currently no indication of a major war in Europe, but conflicts around Europe are more likely. Moreover, it is indisputable that the management of this kind of crises makes immediately available long-term soldiers indispensable. However, it is equally indisputable that an exclusively professional army will be very expensive and will therefore have a very limited size. Hence, it follows that, at present, this exclusively professional army would have to be supplemented in the case of a longer mission outside our borders and, moreover, its personnel strength would be too small to provide a broad basis for national defense. Therefore, reservists will be needed in any case. They guarantee the "growth capability," which is an unrenounceable security policy cornerstone of a central European defense structure. Because of its geostrategic situation, Germany is in a unique situation. It permits our western European partners that change over to professional armies to take "cover" behind the strategic glacis of Germany.

The ability to train reservists is very limited in professional armies because a very limited number of soldiers leaves such armies and would have to be won again as reservists on a voluntary basis. As shown by the U.S. or the British example, the only incentive is money.

The assumption that compulsory military service could be suspended in "times of peace" but be revived in "case of emergency" is unrealistic because, first of all, for obvious reasons, the political decision will always be made very late and, second, from this moment to the first combat-ready draftee, at least 18 months, but probably two years, will pass.

However, without compulsory military service, even the maintenance of a small core of professional soldiers would only be possible with considerable financial expenses. It is little known that the German Army gets about 60 percent of its long-term noncommissioned officers and about 50 percent of the officer candidates from draftees. In order to get an equally large number of "voluntary" applicants, if possible, in the recruiting offices for volunteers, "privileges," as provided as an incentive by professional armies of our allies, would be required.

What the incentives should be in a time of mass unemployment and empty coffers is left to the imagination of our parliamentarians. However, one also must not fail to see social policy aspects. An annual attractiveness program amounting to billions [currency not specified] is required to ensure the competitiveness of a professional army with the civilian labor market.

In Great Britain and in the United States, many of the volunteers are recruited from economically and thus also socially weak regions. We do not have — thank God — such social structures today and, hopefully, will not have them in the future. However, since we do not have the money for accordingly attractive incentives for an appropriate amount of qualified long-term personnel, one will inevitably be forced to make compromises. There is the danger that a mixture of adventurers and unemployed will populate the army. Our society would virtually maintain a "foreign legion," that is, not because the tasks would require that, but because this society would bid farewell to its armed forces in a mixture of political opportunism and social policy indifference.

While the principle of anchoring the army irreversibly in society by compulsory military service stood at the cradle of this Bundeswehr — that is, with a view to our past — in order to prevent it from ever becoming again a state within the state, society would now say good-bye to its armed forces. It would become a society without an army of its own.

Germany: Waigel Restates Need for National Stability Pact

AU2702150696 Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT
in German 27 Feb 96 p 4

[Report by "bbo": "Waigel: National Stability Pact Not Only for European Currency"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Duesseldorf, 26 Feb — FRG Finance Minister Theo Waigel (Christian Social Union [CSU]) has again come out in favor of a National Stability Pact among the Federal Government, Laender, and

communities. At the same time, he denied any connection between his thrift course and Germany's difficulties in fulfilling the criteria for launching the monetary union in 1999. "We are not saving money because of Maastricht, but because this is in Germany's very own interest," Waigel stated at a local policy meeting of the CSU land group in Munich. On the sidelines of the meeting, Hansgeorg Hauser (CSU), parliamentary state secretary in the FRG Finance Ministry, admitted that, according to current estimates, Germany will not fulfill the Maastricht criteria in 1997, either, if nothing is done to counter this development. Federal Government, laender, communities, and social insurance systems must balance the financial deficits through strict thrift measures.

Regarding the persistent accusations that the Federal Government is increasingly shifting financial burdens onto the communities, Waigel stated that the communities and community associations would be far worse off without the Federal Government's community-friendly policy. [quotation marks as published] [passage omitted]

Germany: Greens Oppose Ratification of Europol Convention

AU2702140996 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
RUNDSCHAU in German 27 Feb 96 p 4

[Report by Michael Flaemig: "Greens Warn Against Europol"]

[FBIS Translated Text] In the Bundestag and in the European Parliament, the Alliance 90/Greens are calling

on the government not to ratify the Europol convention in its present form. In this way, they want the new police authority, due to commence work this year, to be under tougher judicial control and that better data protection to be provided.

Claudia Roth, Green deputy in the European Parliament, complained in Bonn that Europol represents a "blatant reversal of democracy at the European level." She said that the striving toward greater security ignores the privacy of citizens. To protect this, Europol must be placed under the auspices of the European Court of Justice, as was originally planned, she said. Citizens could turn to this court if they have complaints about Interpol concerning data protection. Until now, Great Britain has resisted European Court of Justice control over Interpol.

Roth agreed with Winfried Hassemer, Hesse's data protection rapporteur, that Europol in its present form would be a violation of civil rights. "If files on racial origin, health, and sex life are kept, as envisaged by the practical regulations, then it will be easy to prepare international files on homosexuals or people who are HIV positive," said Hassemer. On Friday (23 February), Hassemer complained that the formation of Europol would jeopardize elementary civil rights.

Manfred Such, Greens Bundestag deputy, said that the government would probably table the Europe ratification document in June. The ratification process is already under way in Great Britain.

France Suggests EU Redefine Free Trade Zone Efforts*BR2702155096 Paris LES ECHOS in French
27 Feb 96 p 5*

[Report by Jacques Docquier: "Paris Asks EU For Pause in Establishing Free Trade Zones"]

[FBIS Translated Text] France yesterday asked the EU in Brussels — and the European Commission in particular — to tread water for a while "in the search to establish free trade zones with much of the rest of the world."

French Foreign Minister Herve de Charette said that France, like the Union, is an open partner, but now the time has come to define a global approach, requiring a debate in Council — and, if necessary, the Commission — in order to respect the rules of an open economy while at the same time protecting our employment. He has scarcely concealed his dismay at seeing the Commission proposing the liberalization of world trade by concluding free trade zones with a growing number of EU partners.

The French minister claimed: "These projects risk violating the rules of GATT and our common policies while distorting the agreements concluded with our privileged partners such as the African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries, the countries of Eastern Europe, and those of the Mediterranean. It also represents a risk for employment in Europe." He finally received a favorable response from some of his EU partners. The Fifteen this week therefore abandoned the idea of giving the Community executive a mandate to open talks for the complete liberalization of trade with Mexico. Herve de Charette said: "We must adopt a two-stage approach: an initial agreement preparing for a degree of trade liberalization, and a second agreement governing the implementation of the terms of the first." He was supported in this by Germany in particular, whereas the Commission was looking to cut corners. However, the Fifteen did conclude a political agreement in the evening on the main lines of the mandate that will be given to the Commission for opening talks with South Africa which will lead to free trade.

The South African Exception

Only Germany remained reticent whereas the French position had changed radically. Herve de Charette explained, adopting a stance less circumspect than a few hours previously. Over the coming days, the Fifteen will have to draw up an exact list of all the agricultural products not concerned by this liberalization. This exception has been made to support post-apartheid society. The mandate also insists on the need to respect

the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and its market organizations. It provides an initial list of products not covered by the mechanism — that is to say those products that will not be liberalized, such as corn, sugar, and beef — and gives the Commission consistent lines of negotiation, demanding that it account for everything. Herve de Charette described this as "an excellent text." French warnings were directed above all at the two trade commissioners, Sir Leon Brittan and Manuel Marin. French experts claim that the growing number of free trade zones under the new GATT rules risks forcing the Union to give similar treatment to all its trading partners. Otherwise, those third countries that feel they have been left out could demand compensation. Moreover, there is nothing to say that whole sectors of the economy and much of agriculture might be excluded from this liberalization process.

Finally, such a policy would prevent the Union from granting special concessions to the partners it considers should be privileged, such as the Eastern Europeans. This debate is therefore far from closed and certain member states, led by the United Kingdom, see this policy, on the contrary, as a way of gradually watering down the Union and some of its policies, notably the CAP.

France: Chirac Visit to Asia for 'Improved' Relations*BR2702113596 Paris AFP in French
1808 GMT 26 Feb 96*

[FBIS Translated Text] Paris, 26 Feb (AFP) — President of the Republic Jacques Chirac, who will visit Singapore on Wednesday and Thursday (28 and 29 February) before moving on to the Europe-Asia Summit in Bangkok on Friday and Saturday (1 and 2 March), will call for "improved Euro-Asian relations at a time when Asia is emerging as one of the poles of the future."

Presidential Spokeswoman Catherine Colonna said at a news conference on Monday (26 February): "While Europe is organizing itself to be one of the most stable and dynamic poles of the 21st century, we must be more aware of the fact that the world's future is also being prepared in Asia and we must prepare better for it."

On his first visit to Asia since he was elected, the head of state fully intends promoting France and Europe's "great advantages," as he did in Chicago on 2 February.

Mrs. Colonna said: "He will recommend the spirit of conquest over that of abandonment and fatalism" and "will express the hope that French and Europeans can have more of a presence in Asia" in order to "make up for a considerable delay." She added: "The aim is to

adjust the balance by doubling or tripling our market share if possible."

She added that during a speech to 500 leading figures in Singapore on Thursday, President Chirac will present "his vision of tomorrow's world, a multipolar world marked by a new balance of power." In the "America-Europe-Asia" triangle he regretted that "the Europe-Asia side is the weakest" and that relations are "too weak."

As during his state visit to the United States, the president of the Republic will be accompanied to Singapore and Bangkok by three leading businessmen: Total CEO Thierry Desmarest, Lafarge CEO Bertrand Collomb, and Vice President of Indosuez Christian Maurin.

Five SME (small- and medium-sized businesses) bosses will also accompany him to Singapore: head of TAT (aeronautics) Michel Marchais, CEO of Houles (soft furnishings) Pierre Houles, Hameur (kitchen equipment) boss Pascal de Jenlis, Monetal (telephones) CEO Jean-Michel Seguin, and CEO of MCC (precision measuring equipment) Thierry Lorient.

France: Millon Writes in Support of New Defense Policy

BR2702155396 Paris LE MONDE in French
27 Feb 96 pp 1,13

[Article by French Defense Minister Charles Millon: "Toward a New Defense"]

[FBIS Translated Text] It is history, not chronology, which determines the transition from one century to the next. The 21st century began in Berlin on 9 November 1989 with the fall of the wall. The international system which structured the world since 1945 has disappeared. For France, which has so often been invaded, this is an enormous change: For the first time in its history, it has no threats near its borders.

Confronted with this kind of upheaval, the status quo was untenable. The 1994 White Paper was the first ambitious attempt to understand a world that had suddenly changed. For want of being reflected in the necessary choices, this approach remained unfinished. It had to be carried through to completion. In the decisions which he recently announced the president has drawn all the conclusions of a veritable change of era. The reform being initiated not only implies redefining the missions and resources of our Armed Forces: It is also a revolution in the concepts underlying our defense system. It took an unheard-of exercise lasting six months to achieve this result. Three principles inspired our approach: consistency, openness, and reality.

Why is this reform so sweeping? Because we deliberately chose the comprehensive approach in order to better harmonize a doctrine, personnel, equipment, and an industrial philosophy.

There are two temptations where defense is concerned. The first is to conceive of the requirement for a defense system in an isolated manner and independently of any other consideration, especially where financial resources are concerned. This is hogwash. How can one fail to understand that a nation which is battered by deficits, fractured, and withdrawn into itself is no longer capable of assuming its defense responsibilities? While the world's upheavals impact on all areas of defense, the divided approach is also a harmful temptation. Attacking the problems one after another, without a comprehensive plan, would prevent us from defining a new balance in our defense system, which revolves around four main operational functions: deterrence, prevention, deployment of forces, and protection. In defense matters the approach must be comprehensive if it is to be consistent.

Today, we are backing openness. Confronted with the challenge of globalization, maintaining the French exception is incompatible with splendid isolation. In industry, the requirement for strategic autonomy can no longer be reflected in an active presence in all arms industries. Faced with the sudden contraction of the market and stiff international competition, our defense industry must concentrate on its areas of excellence and play the Europe card.

Major French core areas will emerge, along the lines of the alliance between Dassault and Aerospatiale. Like similar large companies in Germany and the United Kingdom in particular, they will become the pillars which European groups need if they are to fight on equal terms with their U.S. competitors.

This same Europe-oriented approach also contains the priority which we attribute — in cooperation with our partners — to the prevention of crises, the development of intelligence, and space observation.

Our deterrence system itself is moving from one era to another. Thanks to the final round of nuclear testing, we have guaranteed its future reliability and credibility. The dovetailing of our forces into two modernized components is both an essential guarantee for our independence and a major strategic asset for the Europe currently being built.

But the central hub of this profound change in our defense system is the desire to look reality squarely in the eye. While they may not be strictly military in nature, the threats facing us on our national territory

are no less fearsome: terrorism, Mafias, and financial and media manipulation. So it is only logical that today the concept of security is coupled with the concept of defense for the protection of the national territory. It is primarily up to the national gendarmerie to carry out this mission. So let us take care not to confuse the means and the ends by considering habits and instruments as sacred. Let us not transform the much-needed debate on defense into a fight between old and new. As the president emphasized, the "Army is a living body which is evolving along with the missions given to it by the nation."

The new conditions of our own security, as well as our commitment to peace in the world, increasingly imply the use of our forces outside our national territory. The development of our forward action forces is therefore the key factor in the reform. The Gulf War and Bosnia revealed the limits of our current system. Obviously, an Army of conscripts cannot easily respond to the need to have forces on hand which can be deployed immediately, forces which are experienced and which can make best use of the most sophisticated technologies. Historically, an armed nation is indivisible from mass mobilization and the defense of our land borders. Now, the numbers involved are no longer a decisive factor in guaranteeing as best possible the interests of the country and its security. This is why, in six years' time, France will boast a professional Army.

That is the amount of time needed to build up a more modern, stronger Army better able to serve France, its interests, and its international responsibilities. This is the amount of time needed to make our defense industry stronger, more competitive, and more European. This is the right pace to support the adaptation, training, and retraining of men within this massive transformation effort.

But the great Debate is just beginning today, when the decision to mount a professional Army means the disappearance of military service in its current form. Is there a future for a revamped national service? This is not a technical or political military debate in the conventional sense of the term: What is at stake is the very nature of the republican pact, the tie that binds the citizen to the nation. Does the republic call for an obligation to serve before entering working life or must it be left up to a volunteer effort? On the basis of a revamped service geared toward the three poles of security, solidarity, and international cooperation and solidarity, is it possible to restore the most ideal and most necessary term in the republican motto: fraternity. These questions have not yet been settled. Everything needs to be thought up and decided upon.

In this debate, I am convinced that the leading force in a democracy is the taste for living together; that the adhesion of everyone to shared citizenship is the foundation in the spirit of defense; that this is the condition for the independence and freedom of a people.

With the Army model presented by the head of state, we are turning a page in the history of our defense system. This is a reform that cuts across society and the nation. Naturally, one is reminded of the final phrases of "Toward the Career Army": "If this national overhaul were to begin with the Army, then there would be nothing there that did not conform to the natural order of things. Not only because force is more necessary than ever for nations which want to live, but also because the military corps is the most complete expression of a society's spirit."

Italy: Navy Chief Fears 'Escalation' of Fishing Clashes

BR2702140296 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian
27 Feb 96 p 19

[Interview with Admiral Angelo Mariani, chief of Italian Navy staff, by Carlo Chianura in Rome; date not given: "I Fear an Escalation"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Rome — Angelo Mariani was worried. The admiral who led the mission to the Persian Gulf, commander of the first patrol action in the Adriatic Sea during the war in the former Yugoslavia, sat on an elegant green couch in the office overlooking the Tiber that he occupies as chief of Navy staff. Mariani was worried because he fears that it will not stop here. "By nature I tend not to forecast deteriorations," he said, "though I must admit now that the repetition of such episodes at frequent intervals, and especially the form of the latest episode, should prompt us to be very cautious. Certainly," he warned, "if there were to be several repetitions of such events, it would be a very serious matter."

It is no coincidence that since January, since the time of the latest attacks by Tunisian patrol boats on Italian fishing vessels, the Navy has adopted an anything but low-profile line: It has sent to the area a war ship, the frigate "Alpino", and 220 men armed and trained for tasks very different from the protection of fishermen. So it is clear that what Mariani fears most of all is an escalation. The admiral called it an "escalating effect" but it is the same thing.

[Chianura] Admiral, what if there is confirmation of the theory that what lay behind the firing of the shots was the attempt to extort money from the ship owners?

[Mariani] I can only say what I know, and what I know about now is the attack on the fishing vessel. Of course, if there were to be other issues involved, this would show that the question of the monitoring of fishing in the Sicilian Channel is not merely a military matter.

[Chianura] What do you mean?

[Mariani] Simply that the Navy is willing to make its contribution to a complex form of action, let us

say action of a political nature, that involves relations between the two states.

[Chianura] What struck you most about this affair?

[Mariani] The patrol vessel's action was surprising. Though it was in international waters and even though it was aware of the presence of an Italian Navy ship, the Tunisian vessel adopted a particularly aggressive and inflexible stance.

[Chianura] What does that suggest to you?

[Mariani] At least some thoughts about the future. If this practice continues, we must ensure the utmost vigilance.

[Chianura] Are you not in a position to guarantee it?

[Mariani] We are, but we cannot conceal the fact that in Italy we have never completed the task of providing ourselves with a genuine coast guard service that would, as in other countries, ensure the monitoring of fishing, but also the monitoring of pollution and action against clandestine immigration.

[Chianura] Admiral, are you asking for more money for the Navy?

[Mariani] I am calling for the implementation of the sea defense plan, which dates back to the eighties. I honestly consider it excessive for a frigate to carry out such tasks. We would at least like to have another light vessel, such as that which was deployed in Sicily. The optimum situation would be to have eight patrol vessels, as against our present four.

[Chianura] Was there any danger to the Italian crew?

[Mariani] Not to ours, but definitely to the crew of the fishing vessel.

[Chianura] Can you confirm to us that the Tunisians fired at man-height?

[Mariani] Definitely, and fortunately we then encountered a Tunisian Navy patrol boat whose attitude was much more reasonable.

[Chianura] What would have happened otherwise?

[Mariani] You can imagine that for yourself.

Denmark**Denmark Attacks French Stance on South Africa Trade Pact**

BR2802095596 Copenhagen INFORMATION
in Danish 27 Feb 96 p 1, 12

[Report by Jens Bostrup: "EU Threatens Peace in South Africa"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] Brussels — Yesterday France once again tried to block a trade agreement with South Africa when the matter was up for debate at a ministerial meeting in Brussels.

Danish Foreign Minister Niels Helveg Petersen, who arrived at the meeting directly from a visit to South Africa, reacted angrily and accused France of jeopardizing peace and democracy in the country.

"South Africa's chances of getting through the transformation peacefully depend on an acceleration of economic growth. The free trade agreement with the EU is therefore a matter of the greatest importance," Helveg told INFORMATION during a break in the meeting.

The South African economy is already on the move and at the moment it is growing by about 4 percent annually. But growth must reach around 6 percent in order to do something about the terribly high unemployment level of 30-40 percent among the black population, Helveg Petersen declared.

"France has some minor philosophical considerations about the justification for more free trade agreements, but that is not how one should look at this matter. Politically it is absolutely necessary that something radical happens very quickly in this matter and that concrete negotiations begin," Helveg Petersen said.

When this edition went to press it had not been decided if the EU Commission, which negotiates on behalf of the 15 countries, would be given a mandate to conclude the free trade agreement with South Africa. However, the Danish foreign minister was "not optimistic."

The "minor philosophical" French considerations are that the Union has little by little concluded, or is in the process of concluding, free trade agreements with large parts of the world, including all of Eastern Europe, Russia, North Africa, and Latin America. [passage omitted]

Finland**Finland: Halonen Rules Out Defense Alliance With Sweden**

BR2702124396 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET
in Swedish 26 Feb 96 p 11

[Unattributed report: "Defense Alliance Would Go Too Far"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Helsinki — Finnish Foreign Minister Tarja Halonen rejected the idea of a joint defense alliance between Finland and Sweden.

She believed that a defense alliance would go too far even though Sweden and Finland are cooperating closely.

Three former ambassadors, Risto Hyvarinen, Ilkka Pastinen, and Paavo Laitinen, had proposed a defense alliance, citing uncertain developments in Russia.

In an interview in TURUN SANOMAT on Sunday (25 February) Halonen said that a European foreign and security policy now should be developed instead.

She wanted to boost the EU's foreign policy profile by strengthening the position of the troika of presidency countries.

The troika consists of the preceding, the current, and the future presidency country.

The presidency changes hands every six months.

Halonen pointed out that everybody will become more equal if the troika's position is strengthened since every member country will take its share of responsibility because of the rotating presidency.

Sweden**Sweden: Threat, Strength of Russian Forces Analyzed**

BR2702103796 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER
in Swedish 24 Feb 96 p A16

[Report by DAGENS NYHETER correspondent Michael Winiarski: "Hollow Russian Army Is Not Threat to Sweden"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Moscow — Can Russia pose a military threat to Sweden today or in the foreseeable future? In Moscow the answer to this question, which will determine the guidelines of Sweden's defense policy over the next few years, is a resounding no.

In Sweden, as we know, opinions are divided as to how far defense cuts can go. The defense minister has one

view, the supreme commander another, and the political parties have a whole range of different opinions.

One reason for this is the differing forecasts regarding Russia's political future, which appears rather uncertain for some time to come. Within the next four months Russia's leadership might be taken over by the communist party. That could result in a change in Moscow's foreign and military policy. It could, in turn, affect the so-called threatening picture that is an important factor when it comes to outlining Sweden's security policy.

In the near future various Swedish delegations, including the Defense Committee, will visit Russia to establish their own picture before the government submits its report to the Riksdag after the summer recess.

The Swedish decision on defense will determine, among other things, how much money will be spent on military defense over the next five years. In greatly simplified terms, the parliamentarians have two variants to choose from: A major Russian threat, meaning more money spent on defense; and a minor Russian threat and less defense-related spending.

When Swedish politicians and experts ask the question in Moscow, they are given roughly the following answer, which may be more clear-cut than it sounds at home:

No, Russia has neither the will nor the resources to indulge in armed aggression against Sweden. Neither today nor within the next few years can the once so feared Russian Armed Forces pose any military threat to Sweden.

Russia's catastrophic armed intervention in Chechnya has clearly shown that the Russian Army lacks the resources to launch a successful offensive.

This picture of the potential Russian threat to Sweden emerged in talks with military policy commentators in Moscow.

"Russia is not a threat, nor can it become one. It is only a few people and of course the defense industry in Sweden that have an interest in maintaining that Russia could constitute a danger, even a few years down the line." Pavel Felgenhauer, defense policy correspondent for *SEKODNYA* newspaper, said in response to questions from *DAGENS NYHETER*.

"After Chechnya, there was talk everywhere of a surprise attack that was obviously bullshit," Felgenhauer said. Recently Felgenhauer was in Sweden to attend the People and Defense Conference in Salen.

Failings

According to Felgenhauer, the weakness of Russia's conventional forces is not a new phenomenon. The gaps go back a long way, and most weapons systems date back to the 1960's and 1970's.

"It would take at least 25 to 30 years to establish an offensive force that would effectively pull off an invasion on foreign soil, for instance in Sweden. It would require the total rearmament of several divisions. It would take decades, even if Vladimir Zhirinovskiy was in power."

Dmitry Trenin, a security policy researcher at the Carnegie Foundation's office in Moscow, claimed that Russia had never been as weak militarily as it is today. By "never" he means that you would have to go back to the 18th century to find a Russia that was so weak in military terms, albeit relative to the surrounding powers.

"Russia has always considered military strength as a basis for its foreign policy. When that basis is missing, the country's leaders do not rightly know what to do," Trenin said.

Selected at Random

The truth today is that Russia's conventional military power is in such poor shape that the Army is not even able to conduct a regional war and win it, far less so a local war, like the one in Chechnya. To manage moderately well, Russia was forced to gather combat-ready units from airborne divisions and marine infantry from the furthest-flung corners of the country. According to Trenin, quite simply no complete "elite force" ever existed.

"And the situation will soon deteriorate further."

Despite constant talk of "military reform," there has been nothing more than initial stirrings in this direction. Trenin laid the blame for this squarely at Yeltsin's door.

"It is one of the present government's biggest failures. Instead of reform, Yeltsin has placed the emphasis on establishing loyalty among the military. And so everything remained as it was in the good old days."

One explanation is that the Armed Forces were subjected to extreme strain in the early 1990's, among other things because more than 1 million troops were withdrawn from the lost Eastern Bloc (the German Democratic Republic and other satellite states).

What will happen if Russia changes its political color, if Gennadiy Zyuganov becomes president, and the communists control parliament, the government, and the

Kremlin? Not even then would there be a radical change in security policy, Trenin forecast.

"Today's Russia is not a democracy, it is more like an oligarchy with some democratic traits. With communists in the Kremlin the direction of Russia's policy would shift slightly. But even the current regime is going in for more nationalism."

In Trenin's opinion, the major problem is that Moscow lacks a clear policy compared with the "post-Soviet sphere," above all Ukraine, the Caucasus, and central Asia. Nobody has succeeded in defining what Russia's national interests comprise, so there is no security policy doctrine.

Few Exercises

"But not even the communists can recreate the Soviet Union. The most they can hope for is that Belarus will join the Russian state. All other countries will retain their sovereignty. Zyuganov will plow ahead with his rhetoric, but when it soon becomes apparent that nobody wants to surrender their independence, he will be forced to conclude that it did not work out," Trenin said.

One problem is that the Russian units have not mounted any real exercises for several years, another analyst pointed out. As recently as two years ago, units of the Russian Army trained for a major attack. Now there are only two defined objectives for the Army: The first is to defend the country's territory, and the second is to participate in peacekeeping operations in other countries, for example the former Yugoslavia and Abkhazia.

Duma member Sergey Yushenkov, who is a leading member of Yegor Gaidar's Russia's Democratic Choice, almost laughed at DAGENS NYHETER's questions about whether any aggressive Russian intentions vis-a-vis Sweden might come to the fore.

Oversized

"Not even under Stalin were there any such plans. And since it is hard to imagine a worse regime, the question is rather abstract," Yushenkov said.

Up until the last election he was chairman of the Duma's Defense Committee. Now he is just an average member of the committee.

Unlike other analysts, Yushenkov did not believe that the Army's conduct in Chechnya is representative of the quality of the Russian war machine, because it is not designed to interfere in ethnic conflicts. As a whole, he believed, the Russian defense force is capable of repelling any form of aggression whatsoever. However,

for the time being he sees no real threat to Russia's borders.

He also shared the general view that the situation in the Army is "serious." But he believed that it cannot be objectively claimed that it is "catastrophic." According to Yushenkov, the heart of the problem lies in the fact that the Soviet Union built up a grotesquely oversized military industrial complex because of the ideological confrontation raging between "socialism and capitalism," something which itself contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union. But this complex still remains largely intact, and it is undergoing a grave crisis.

"We must radically scale down our Armed Forces, and I mean not just those that come under the authority of the Defense Ministry, but also those that belong to the 20 other authorities which have armed personnel," Yushenkov said.

The money that the government earmarked for the present, giant Army — a total of \$3 trillion rubles (120 billion kronor) — is not sufficient to maintain even elementary functions. Russian television reports almost daily that the Russian troops stationed in Chechnya are not receiving food, clothes, and fuel.

Although "everyone" knows that the Army must be significantly streamlined, and Yeltsin has occasionally spoken out in favor of this, nothing is being done. Any attempts to actually do something crumble under opposition from the officers' corps.

The need is almost bottomless. Many people are unaware that the number of armed men in Russia today is proportionally greater than during the Soviet era. The newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI wrote recently that the Soviet Union (with its 280 million inhabitants) had a total of 8 million armed men. Today's Russia (with approximately 150 million inhabitants and a territory that has shrunk) has more than 7.5 million armed men. The defense force (Army, Navy, and so forth) accounts for 1.7 million of this total. The rest are spread over domestic troops, the federal security service (formerly the KGB), border troops, railway troops, and the presidential guard.

Police State

According to the author of this article, all this shows that Russia is on the way to becoming a police state. The number of policemen has increased by 50 percent in five years, and most of them are used to protect the men in power and senior officials. And the domestic troops are well equipped, in principle having all kinds of munitions, except for warplanes and nuclear weapons.

Perhaps we may conclude that the Russian people have considerably more to worry about than the population of neighboring countries like Sweden.

Sweden: Hjelm-Wallen Sets Up New Submarine Inquiry

BR2302153096 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET
in Swedish 23 Feb 96 p 8

[Report by Mikael Holmstrom: "New Inquiry Into Submarine Violations"]

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] On Thursday [22 February] Foreign Minister Lena Hjelm-Wallen set up an inquiry to carry out a security policy investigation into the submarine violations.

Section counsellor Lars-Erik Lundin of the Foreign Ministry's political department will be responsible for the actual inquiry. Ambassadors Carl Johan Groth and Lennart Mynsten and political scientist Rutger Lindahl will be a reference group to assist the investigator.

Undermined Protest

The new inquiry will begin where the submarine commission got bogged down. The commission stated that

it is a certainty that Sweden had been violated but did not follow the directive to put the intrusions into a historical, security and defense policy context. As a result the submarine commission in practice undermined the strong diplomatic protest which the Palme government delivered to the Soviet Union in 1983 after submarines and minisubmarines had been operating in the Harsfjarden area in the fall of 1982.

To Cover the Period 1980-1995

The new inquiry will include "a security policy investigation of foreign submarines' violations of Swedish waters in the period 1980-95." According to the directives, the government and the Foreign Affairs Council must be kept continually informed of the progress of the work; no deadline has been set for this.

"I cannot comment on the assignment," Lars-Erik Lundin said himself. [passage omitted]

Cyprus: Kliridhis Rejects 'Dayton-Type Procedure'
NC2702134296 Nicosia CYPRUS NEWS AGENCY
in English 1149 GMT 27 Feb 96

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Nicosia, Feb 27 (CNA) — Cyprus President Glavkos Kliridhis has rejected the idea of a Dayton-type procedure for a solution to the Cyprus problem, stressing that the situation in Cyprus is different to that of Bosnia.

In an interview with the Greek television, Kliridhis noted that in the case of Bosnia a hasty solution was reached in order to avoid a terrible bloodshed. "Whether the solution reached is going to last is something to be seen in the future", he added.

In the case of Cyprus, he said, there is no need for doing something hasty because despite the continuation of Turkish occupation of 37 per cent of the island's territory there is no bloodshed.

The suggestion that a Dayton-type of procedure is probably the only way forward towards a comprehensive agreement on the Cyprus problem, was expressed by Greek American leader and president of the council of overseas Hellenes (Greeks), Andrew Athens, who visited Cyprus last week.

In his interview with the Greek television, President Kliridhis also said no new U.S. initiative on Cyprus would be launched, at present, because of the inability of Turkish political parties to form a government.

Kliridhis said Carrie Cavanaugh, director of the office of southern European affairs at the U.S. State Department, reaffirmed, during his recent visit to the island, President Bill Clinton's position that the U.S. would undertake within 1996 a role for a solution to the Cyprus problem, after a Turkish government is formed.

Cyprus has been divided since 1974 when Turkish troops invaded and occupied 37 per cent of its territory.

Turkey has blocked several U.N., U.S. and British initiatives for a solution to the protracted Cyprus problem.

Cyprus: Atun Asks EU To Call Greek Cypriots to Negotiate

TA2802060696 Nicosia Bayrak Radio in Turkish
1630 GMT 27 Feb 96

[FBIS Translated Text] Prime Minister Hakkı Atun has warned the EU that it should close its doors on the Greek Cypriot unilateral application to the EU and call the Greek Cypriots to sit at the negotiating table with the Turkish Cypriot side. Atun said that the reasonable thing

to do in Cyprus is to put aside armament efforts, sit at the negotiating table, and search for a solution through mutual respect shown for the rights of both sides. Pointing out that the Turkish Cypriot Peace Forces have been securing peace in Cyprus since 1974 within the framework of the guarantee agreements, Atun stressed that it is out of question for the Turkish Cypriots to make concessions on the guarantee agreement.

In a statement to a Bayrak Radio and Television correspondent, Atun said that the hostile behavior displayed by Greece against Turkey at the EU platform during the past few days should be watched closely. Pointing out that this behavior can be considered as setting an example of future behavior and attitude, Atun added: Consequently, the Turkish Cypriots' retention of the guarantee system has been justified once again.

Stressing the importance of not disrupting the balance between the two motherlands at international platforms, Atun recalled that this point has been especially emphasized in the guarantee agreements.

In his warning statement to EU officials, Atun pointed out that the EU should suspend the Greek Cypriot unilateral EU application and make them sit at the negotiating table. Atun reiterated his view that the EU membership issue can be raised after the Cyprus issue is resolved.

Explaining that Turkey is fulfilling its requirements on its way to a Customs Union with the EU, Atun underlined that Europe should raise the issue of Turkey's full membership in the EU despite the negative behavior displayed by Greece.

Noting that Turkey and Greece have both advantages and disadvantages regarding the Cyprus issue [words indistinct], Atun pointed out that the Turkish Cypriots' entry into a union that does not include Turkey, and in which Greece is a full member, poses certain dangers. Atun further emphasized that the Turkish Cypriots cannot renounce the guarantees.

Commenting on Greek Cypriot armament efforts in his statement, Atun said that the Turkish Cypriots are not concerned with the Greek Cypriots' arming themselves. Urging the Greek Cypriots to realize that they cannot achieve anything in Cyprus by doing so, Atun added: Reason says that peace can be achieved only by sitting at the negotiating table and showing respect for mutual rights. Atun further stated that the answer to this issue lies in a comprehensive solution through both sides acknowledging each other's rights.

Greece: Pangalos on EU Debate on Conflict With Turkey

NC2702210196 Athens ET-1 Television Network
in Greek 1900 GMT 27 Feb 96

[FBIS Translated Text] We have a statement by the foreign minister upon his arrival from Brussels. Correspondent Anneta Kavvadhia has a report:

[Begin recording] [Kavvadhia] Returning from Brussels today, Foreign Minister Theodoros Pangalos appeared determined to exercise a veto on the financial benefits Turkey might get from its customs union with the EU. In an attempt to clarify events in Brussels yesterday the foreign minister was clear when he said that the initial announcement of the joint position of the 15 [EU members] mentioned territorial claims by Turkey and the influence on its relations with the EU. Pangalos believes the document binds the EU.

[Pangalos] It is clear that the remaining 14 [EU] countries remain committed to this document, which is why it was not abandoned, but was released for publication by the presidency acting on its own responsibility. This is the first time the EU has said that Turkey's conflict with Greece, Turkey's attack at the expense of Greece, concerns the EU and affects EU relations with Turkey. This is a major development... [sentence incomplete]

[Kavvadhia] Recalling that financial aid for Turkey has been frozen, Pangalos stressed that this is the way things will stay until the next association council if Turkey does not stop disputing things.

[Pangalos] We hope Turkey will return to the starting block, stop disputing things, or, at least, resolve the dispute through international law. We cannot stop them thinking that one island or another belongs to them. Tansu Ciller said 3,500 islands in the Aegean belong to her. But, as you know, the Aegean only has something like 2,500 islands. So we cannot prevent this but if they have any disputes, let them subject them, as all civilized states must do, to international procedures and state their demands.

[Kavvadhia] Pangalos described the British ambassador's retraction of his [foreign] minister's commitments as unprecedented diplomatic tactics. Responding to accusations by New Democracy, Pangalos stressed that Miltiadhis Evert should study his files. Let him give us a few days, he noted, adding that no petty partisan logic should prevail, because we all share the same concern. [end recording]

Turkey: Ciller Says Visit to Italy 'Positive'

TA2802074996 Ankara TRT Television Network
in Turkish 2200 GMT 27 Feb 96

[FBIS Translated Text] Prime Minister Tansu Ciller returned to Turkey at around 2250 tonight. In her arrival statement at Esenboga Airport, Ciller said:

[Begin Ciller recording] The meetings I held with Italian President Luigi Scalfaro and Prime Minister Lamberto Dini were constructive, sincere, and extremely positive. The Italian Government informed us that Turkey will be supported by Italy at the highest level within the EU framework.

As you know, Greece has been taking steps to portray to the world public the initiatives and stand Turkey took with regard to the recent Kardak crisis in a different light. We have clearly explained the Turkish thesis. We clearly stated that Turkey will not renounce its sovereignty rights and that it will not allow a fait accompli as was the case in the Kardak crisis. Furthermore, we pointed out that such issues should be taken up at international platforms through a dialogue and in a manner that will incorporate the entirety of the relations. Within this framework, we also assessed the developments in Turkish-EU relations. We also noted the necessity of activating as soon as possible the financial protocol concluded within the framework of the Turkish-EU agreement.

I would like to state clearly that Italy, which is the current EU term president, was positive in its discussion of the constructive attitude adopted by Turkey with regard to the Kardak crisis as well as the Aegean problems. Italy further told us that it will extend its support to us on the issue. Italy noted that, as the EU term president, it will initiate the necessary steps to active the financial protocol as soon as possible. We were also told that Turkey's views will be considered at the international governmental relations talks to be held in Turin. Italy further noted that it will take initiatives for Turkey's participation in the forthcoming Milan and subsequent European summits.

We found the opportunity to state clearly Turkey's theses within the framework of Turkish-Greek relations as well as that of its agreements with the EU. I am happy to state that Italy told us that it understands all of Turkey's theses and that it will support them in all international platforms. I assess this development as positive. Therefore, I believe that my visit has attained its goal. It has been auspicious for our country. As always, I am very happy to have returned to my country. I bid you a good night. (end recording)

Turkey: Ankara Welcomes EU Handling of CU Debate

TA2702162996 Ankara ANATOLIA in English
1556 GMT 27 Feb 96

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Ankara, Feb 27 (A.A.) — Ankara on Tuesday welcomed the European Union's (EU) 14 members' acknowledgement of their responsibilities under Customs Union [CU] accord.

A Foreign Ministry statement on the issue said Greece failed to find support 'despite all its efforts' during EU Foreign Ministers Council from the other EU member countries.

The statement said the council did not issue a document concerning Turkish-Greek tension adding 'in other words, 14 member countries acknowledged the solidarity to their responsibilities to Turkey within the framework of the Customs Union accord.'

'Yet' the statement added, 'the process of financial cooperation between Turkey and Europe within the framework of Customs Union should begin.'

Turkey: Batu Discusses Policy Toward Greece

NC2802111496 Istanbul TURKIYE in Turkish
24 Feb 96 p 15

[Interview with Inal Batu, Turkish Foreign Ministry deputy undersecretary responsible for relations with Greece, by Mahmut Bulut in Ankara; date not given]

[FBIS Translated Text] [Bulut] Why did we recall our ambassador to Athens?

[Batu] Greek hostility toward us is taking on new and serious dimensions. It is trying to systematically block Turkey's vital interests. The worst thing of all is the move to render customs union ineffective. Customs union will be de facto inoperative if Greece vetoes the credits on 26 February, because customs union agreement obligates both sides. It is not a mechanism working unilaterally. These developments led us to recall our ambassador. We will make the necessary assessments. We are determined to retaliate in kind for Greece's hostile policies.

[Bulut] How long will our ambassador to Athens stay in Turkey?

[Batu] It is not clear. He will visit the ministry on Monday [26 February], when we will begin our work immediately. We will make the necessary assessments with our ambassador. We expect the friendly EU countries to dissuade Greece from its policy of rendering customs union inoperative. We also hope reason will prevail in Greece.

[Bulut] If Greece vetoes the customs union credits, will we retaliate by announcing that we have frozen or annulled the customs union process?

[Batu] If a thing does not function de facto it is already frozen. We will assess everything. We will think of the necessary measures to harm Greek interests wherever they may be. We are determined. It could be anywhere. We will make the necessary assessments.

[Bulut] Have any measures been taken around Kardak [Imia]? Is there tension there?

[Batu] Greece resorted to escalating tension around Kardak last weekend. In short, developments are not auspicious. It dispatched its fishing boats and frigates near the rocks. But things returned to the way they were, following firm initiatives and equivalent measures on our part. But this time round they escalated the tension in the political arena.

[Bulut] What is the EU's feeling following contacts by Baykal? Can anything be said concerning its position on the customs union credits?

[Batu] In a few days we will all be seeing the result of Greece's initiative and the response of the EU members. The initial signals indicate that the EU members' position is positive. According to our information, the EU members are telling Greece: "We will freeze Cyprus' accession to the EU and credit earmarked for Greece could also suffer." Of course, the final result is what matters for us. It is important that a result is obtained and the Greek obstacle is removed. The EU must fulfill its obligations for the customs union to work. Next week will be important.

Turkey: U.S. Policy on Water Dispute With Syria Viewed

NC2802122896 Istanbul HURRIYET in Turkish
26 Feb 96 p 12

[Article by Ferai Tinc: "The United States Gets Involved in Euphrates Waters" — from the "Footnote" column]

[FBIS Translated Text] The United States decided to get involved in the transnational waters problem between Turkey and Syria. The Clinton Administration wants to contest the presidential elections with a Middle East peace agreement in hand. It has arranged to have the transnational waters issue included in it.

Turkish Foreign Ministry officials have said that "the problem concerns only Turkey and Syria," however, one of Prime Minister Shim'on Peres' high-ranking aides has conveyed a different view to THE JERUSALEM POST. He said: "The U.S. officials have made arrange-

ments with Syria, Turkey, and Israel on the water problem, and have held talks with us. Constructing a pipeline to pump water is not necessary. The concern is how the water can be shared among the three countries."

U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher held talks in Damascus on the sharing of water, which will involve Turkey. THE JERUSALEM POST reported that "the United States hopes that Israel and Syria will reach an agreement on water supply." Obviously, the hope is nourished by the water resources in Turkey.

It seems that Turkey's water resources have been directly linked to the establishment of peace in the Middle East. Israel does not want to take any steps relating to the return of the Golan Heights to Syria before it is given a guarantee on water supply. In fact, it has recently conveyed a message to Syria saying that it "should reach an agreement with Turkey and then agree to leave the water resources on the Golan Heights to Israel."

Considering opposition leader Netanyahu's pressure, the Israeli Government has said that "the water resources on the Golan Heights will not be abandoned." Meanwhile, Syria has tried to use the deadlock caused by the water problem to its advantage in the Middle East peace effort. It has tried to internationalize its problem with Turkey and to secure Israel's support.

It appears that the Euphrates' waters have become a trump card in the Middle East talks.

As far as Turkey is concerned, the situation is unacceptable, however, the United States wants to expand on the matter. It has put pressure on Syria about its terrorist activities in order to persuade Turkey. In fact, it has called on Damascus to not support the Workers Party of Kurdistan. A U.S. State Department spokesman has said: "We expect concrete steps. Otherwise, Syria will not receive economic aid, even if it finalizes a peace agreement with Israel."

Syria does not believe it has anything to lose in its relations with Washington. So the U.S. pressure is not important for it, however, the U.S. initiatives on the water issue are important for Turkey. Obviously, Turkey will feel the effects of Washington's pressure more than Syria.

Who does not want the establishment of peace in the Middle East? Who does not want relief for the exhausted people? But will Turkey have to pay the price for peace? This seems to be the objective behind the move Syria made to further complicate the problem when the Middle East peace talks began.

Turkey: NSC Advises Extension of State of Emergency

TA2602142796 Ankara TRT Television Network
in Turkish 1400 GMT 26 Feb 96

[FBIS Translated Text] The National Security Council [NSC] met this morning. The statement issued after the meeting has just reached us. According to the statement, the NSC has decided to inform the Council of Ministers of another four-month extension of the state of emergency in effect in 10 provinces.

The NSC met under President Suleyman Demirel at the Cankaya Mansion this morning. A statement issued by the NSC Secretariat General after the meeting says the following: Security and public order throughout the country as well as the state of emergency currently in effect in 10 provinces have been assessed. A unity of view has been reached that it will be appropriate to extend by another four months, starting from 19 March 1996, the state of emergency currently in effect in 10 provinces, and a decision has been made to inform the Council of Ministers on the issue. Significant political developments were also reviewed and assessed at the meeting.

Prime Minister Tansu Ciller; General Ismail Hakki Karadayi, chief of staff; Deniz Baykal, foreign minister and deputy prime minister; National Defense Minister Vefa Tanir; Interior Minister Teoman Unusan; Gen. Hikmet Bayar, commander of the Ground Forces; Admiral Guven Erkaya, commander of the Naval Forces; Gen. Ahmet Corekci, commander of the Air Forces; General Ilhan Kilic, NSC secretary general; and other officials attended the monthly routine meeting of the NSC.

Turkey: Demirel Interviewed on New Coalition Effort

NC2802082396 Istanbul HURRIYET in Turkish
26 Feb 96 p 18

[Text] of an interview with President Suleyman Demirel by HURRIYET columnist Sedat Ergin in Ankara; date not given]

[FBIS Translated Text] [Ergin] Can Motherland Party [ANAP] leader Mesut Yilmaz be designated if a serious initiative is taken to establish a coalition between the ANAP and the True Path Party [DYP]?

[Demirel] Yes. I have designated him to establish the new government. It is up to him to decide the party he wants to cooperate with and who he wants to talk to. I want a government that will secure the National Assembly's vote of confidence. I want the government to be formed within the National Assembly's framework so I am not in a rush. I want the necessary amount of time to be used for the process. I want a result. This is what is happening. There is nothing to compel us to

say that this or that should have been done. An effort is being made to establish the new government. All the rules are being applied. We will wait to see the result in a few days.

We are not desperate for time. The limit is not two or three days. We have 45 days. The period will expire on 23 March. This means we have a lot of time, nearly a month. If the prime minister designate uses a few more days, it will not harm the country. No one will interrupt the prime minister designate's work.

[Ergin] Can you comment on the resumption of contacts between the ANAP and the DYP?

[Demirel] I cannot. I do not want to influence the process. I designated a political party leader to establish the new government, and that is what I expect him to do.

[Ergin] Do you expect the government problem to be solved before the 45 days expire? Are you optimistic?

[Demirel] Yes, I am. The effort is being maintained within its bounds. I welcome the importance the media have attached to it. Democracy is marching on. Developments taking place in Turkey are similar to those we have admired abroad.

[Ergin] Considering the system we have in Turkey, can you comment on the talks the ANAP held with the Welfare Party for three weeks?

[Demirel] I believe their talks were very important. They tried hard. The establishment of the government has become an issue that concerns the entire people, and it is interesting. It is discussed in every coffee shop and home. It is discussed wherever two people meet, which should be welcomed. The importance attached to politics will encourage activity in the field. I must stress that the media encourage the regime to maintain its functions. Yes, the media are very effective in the country.

[Ergin] Bureaucracy has been obstructed by the delay in establishing the government. Can you comment on that?

[Demirel] It would have been established after the elections, but the parliament's structure did not allow that. It will not be the first or the last time. Turkey will get used to similar situations. Meanwhile, it will learn to avoid being affected by them. Everyone must concern himself with his own work. We have a multiparty system, and all our institutions, including the National Assembly, are functioning. Nevertheless, the failure of the effort to establish the new government has created psychological effects. It has affected bureaucracy, but our institutions are in control of all the domestic and foreign problems. For example, the National Security Council will meet tomorrow.

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 352
MERRIFIELD, VA.

This is a U.S. Government publication produced by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS). Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

FBIS collects, translates, disseminates, and analyzes foreign open-source information on behalf of the U.S. Government. Its publications may contain copyrighted material. ***Copying and dissemination is prohibited without permission of the copyright owners.***

- Bracketed indicators before the first sentence of each item describe the way in which the material was processed by FBIS.
- Headline : and all bracketed explanatory notes are supplied by FBIS.
- Personal and place names are rendered in accordance with the decisions of the U.S. Board on Geographic Names as adapted by FBIS. Unverified names in radio and television material appear in parentheses and are spelled phonetically; words and phrases in parentheses preceded by a question mark are unclear in the original and deduced from context.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

U.S. Government Customers

For a list of FBIS products, to subscribe to an FBIS publication, or to indicate a change of address contact:

FBIS
P.O. Box 2604
Washington, DC 20013-2604
Telephone: (202) 338-6735
FAX: (703) 733-6042

Non-Government Customers

Subscriptions are available from the National Technical Information Service:

NTIS
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, VA 22161
Telephone: (703) 487-4630
FAX: (703) 321-8547

New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

29 Feb 1996